

308 445

**VENTURA COUNTY TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION**5156 McGRATH STREET  
VENTURA, CA 93003(805) 644-3291  
(805) 644-9208 FAXPOST OFFICE BOX 3878  
VENTURA, CA 93006

Docket Management System  
U. S. Department of Transportation  
400 Seventh Street, S. W.  
Washington, D.C. 20590-001  
Room PL-401  
Re: Cabrillo Port Liquefied Natural Deepwater Port  
License Application, Docket No. USCG 2004-1 6877 -614

The Ventura County Taxpayers Association comments on the DEIR/DEIS for BHP Billiton's Cabrillo Port Project as follows:

We find that Section 1.2 addressing the need for the Project could be expanded to be more comprehensive in the description of California's existing reliance for about 85% of its Natural Gas requirements from out of State sources.

We are very well aware of the negative impacts to the citizens and taxpayers of Ventura County and the State of California that occurred during the 2000-2001 Energy Crisis, which is that, the taxpayer will be paying off mistakes made for years and years to come.

It is obvious that California needs new and diverse sources of energy, this is evidenced by the California Energy Commissions own reports, the Federal government's data from the ENE Energy Information Administration, the California Energy Crisis of 2000-2001 and the recent pricing trend of Natural gas which in a market economy is an implicit indicator of supply vs. demand imbalance's when commodity prices run up so quickly and stay in the higher pricing tier.

We are aware that just a few weeks ago the San Onofre nuclear generating station went off-line, resulting in additional gas fired generating capacity being brought on line to make up the shortfall in electricity production, and causing severe strain on gas supplies and nearly resulting blackouts and disruption of electricity and natural gas supplies. The California Energy Commission besides stating the need for LNG as a new and diverse source of clean burning natural gas has also stated that California potentially faces a potentially significant energy shortage form 2006 onwards.

It is evident that in order to prevent further instances of the 2000-2001 Energy Crisis, which may have been only been a minor precursor to the future, California needs significant new energy infrastructure. Conservation measures and full development of our renewable resources must occur in an economically sound manner that does not burden the taxpayer unnecessarily or unfairly, we believe however that those measures will be insufficient to address the magnitude of the energy problems in California we therefore endorse BHP Billiton's Cabrillo Port as a useful and needed project that will add a diverse and new source of clean burning natural gas, which contrary to recent elected officials statements is to be funded entirely from the private sector without taxpayer support or subsidy.

Don Facciano  
President

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

2004 DEC 16 12:45:52

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPERIOR COURT  
VENTURA COUNTY

Origin: E&E Website  
Date: 12/20/2004  
First Name: Margaret  
Last Name: Farnham  
Address: 111A Cameron Court  
City: Chapel Hill  
State: NC  
Topic: Other/General Comment

Comments: I live near the coast and enjoy weekend trips to the beach. I know what it means to want to protect our beautiful coasts. I also know the importance of natural gas to this nation. We need projects developed now that set a positive example for future projects to come. That's why I've taken such an interest on Cabrillo Port. A temporary, environmentally safe rig located far out to sea should be applauded.

G346-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Origin: E&E Website  
Date: 12/20/2004  
First Name: Loren  
Last Name: Farnsworth  
Address: 551 W. Washington  
City: El Cajon  
State: CA  
Zip Code: 92020  
Topic: Other/General Comment

Comments: I am in the Navy and I have made Southern California my home for my family and I. In a couple of years I will be getting out of the Navy and I will be looking for a good job to support my wife and my two children. If California continues to drive businesses out of state, because of a lack of infrastructure needed to stay competitive, then I will be forced to uproot my family and move to where I can find work. Millionaires in Malibu may be happy with the way things are, but California's families need good jobs and low utility bills. The Cabrillo Deepwater Port will help to provide both of those. I support the Cabrillo Deepwater Port and ask that you do also.

G325-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Origin: E&E Website  
Date: 12/18/2004  
First Name: Rachel  
Last Name: Farnsworth  
Address: 598 Aiso St  
City: Ventura  
State: CA  
Zip Code: 93001  
Topic: Transportation  
Comments: Yes there will be some traffic changes and construction work on our roads for a short time. It is worth putting up with those short term inconveniences for what we are getting in return for the long run. I am for the Proposed project and hope to see it underway sooner than later.

G169-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Date: 11/29/2004

Docket Management Facility  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
Room PL-401  
400 Seventh Street, SW  
Washington DC 20590-0001

U. S. Coast Guard  
California State Lands Commission

Re: Proposed LNG Terminal at Oxnard, California  
Preliminary scooping hearing 15 March 2004

While the consensus of the hearing was directed on the matter of the safety of transport or storage of LNG, the major aspect should be its alternative, renewable energy. It can be entered into with available resources. It does not compromise the fiscal aspects resulting from balance of payment problems. Thus nothing could be more patriotic and consistent with the security of this nation than living within our means by maximizing solar and wind produced energy or bio-mass produced fuels.

G062-1

The latter are in fact solar fuels that offer the potential for a decline in concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. Thus the alternative of rejection of importation of LNG includes national safety from terrorism and improvements in fiscal prospects for our nation as a whole.

The U.S. Coast guard can not assure safety of navigation at sea nor the security of the proposed Port Cabrillo, nor can safety be assured of transfer terminals or pipelines.

G062-2

The sun at a ninety-three hundred million mile radius offers both energy and reliable security.

Rimmon C Fay, Ph.D.  
623 Sunfish Way  
Port Hueneme CA 93041

*NOTE: Dr. Rimmon Fay served on the California Coastal Commission for thirteen years and is a noted Marine Biologist. Two months after the above letter was written, Dr. Fay suffered a series of strokes. He is currently hospitalized.*

G062-1

Sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 address conservation and renewable energy sources, within the context of the California Energy Commission's 2005 Integrated Energy Report and other State and Federal energy reports, as alternatives to replace additional supplies of natural gas.

G062-2

Section 4.2 discusses this topic. Potential impacts have been identified and mitigation measures have been proposed to reduce potential risks associated with construction and/or operation of the proposed Project.

Date: 11/29/2004

Comments on proposal to import LNG to Oxnard California  
Hearing 15 March 2004  
Rimmon C. Fay, Ph. D.

Vessel transport by sea is vulnerable to accident and deliberate acts of terrorism. Collision and grounding are as old as sailing itself. Navigation in the local area of the ocean is complicated by weather, the movement of naval vessels as well as offshore supply and fishing vessels, the nearly daily movement of car carriers and container carriers through the channel. This system relies upon vessel to vessel voluntary communication under circumstances unregulated by the U. S. Coast Guard. It is proposed to introduce into these circumstances ships burdened with cargos calculated in terms of the explosion potential of nuclear weapons. Two examples in recent memory of collision and sinking include 1) the incident of a car carrier bound for Port Hueneme colliding with another vessel in the English Channel and 2) the loss of life with the off shore service boat in the vessel collision in the Mississippi River. Shipping accidents do occur and continue to happen! Planning and regulation must be provided to minimize the potential of their occurrence.

Fossil fuels will be available at tolerable but uncertain cost for an unknown period into the future. What is certain is that the continued release of carbon dioxide from the combustion of fossil fuels will increase global warming and the uncertainty of violent uncontrolled weather of more severe intensity may be expected as weather patterns change thus further complicating the local situation.

Coincident with global warming has been the observed decline in fishing production and a decrease in the abundance of plankton. Part of this decline and change in abundance results from the use of seawater for heating and cooling purposes that is accomplished by passing the seawater through pumps and other diversion devices in processes known as entrainment and impingement that kill a significant portion of the plankton exposed to these processes. As now planned, Seawater will be used as a heat source in the vaporization of LNG with a loss of marine life.

We are entering a period of enormous fiscal uncertainty both as a State and a Nation knowing only that fossil fuel will become more expensive and our ability to deal with National and State debt as a part of the global balance of payments is more uncertain than ever.

The conclusion is to not enter into arrangements to import a dangerous cargo under uncertain circumstances, to not add to global warming while compromising the economic capacity of this Nation and world with adverse environmental consequences. The only course to recommend is inescapable. The alternative is to place increased reliance upon renewable energy sources as sound environmental and fiscal choices essential to the stewardship of this Nation and the planet.

*NOTE: Dr. Rimmon Fay served on California Coastal Commission for thirteen years and is a noted Marine Biologist. Two months after the above comments were presented to the Coast Guard & State Lands Commission Public Meetings on March 15, 2004, Dr. Fay suffered a series of strokes. He is currently still hospitalized.*

G388-1

G388-2

G388-3

G388-4

G388-1

Section 4.2 and Appendix C contain additional information on public safety. Section 4.3 contains information on marine traffic. Appendix F of the Independent Risk Assessment (Appendix C1) presents the marine traffic and ship collision modeling used in the analysis. Appendix C3 contains information on marine safety and security requirements.

G388-2

Sections 4.6.1.4 and 4.20.3.6 discuss Project emissions of greenhouse gases. Section 4.1.8 contains additional information on oceanographic conditions in the Project area and on Project design.

G388-3

The Project has been revised since issuance of the October 2004 Draft EIS/EIR. Section 2.2.2.3 contains information on this topic. Regasification of LNG would be accomplished using combustion vaporizers submerged in fresh water, using boil-off natural gas as the fuel and recirculated engine cooling water for heat sources. Seawater would not be used as a heat source.

The previously proposed FSRU generator engine cooling system used seawater as the source of cooling water for the four generator engines. The Applicant now proposes using a closed tempered loop cooling system that circulates water from two of the eight submerged combustion vaporizers (SCVs) through the engine room and back to the SCVs, which reduces the seawater intake volume by about 60 percent. The seawater cooling system would remain in place to serve as a backup system during maintenance of the SCVs or when the inert gas generator is operating. Section 2.2.2.4 contains a description of the proposed uptakes and water uses for the FSRU.

Section 4.7.4 contains information on uptake volumes and potential impacts of seawater uptake and discharge on marine biota, including ichthyoplankton from intake of seawater, from thermal discharges of cooling water. The ichthyoplankton impact analysis (Appendix H1) includes both literature results and data from California Cooperative Oceanic Fisheries Investigations (CalCOFI) surveys. CalCOFI surveys have been consistently collected over a period of time and are the best scientific data currently available.

G388-4

Section 1.2 discusses dependence of foreign sources of energy. Sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 address conservation and renewable energy sources, within the context of the California Energy Commission's 2005 Integrated Energy Report and other State and

Federal energy reports, as alternatives to the Project.

Origin: E&E Website  
Date: 12/20/2004  
First Name: Ralph  
Last Name: Felix  
Address: 42203 North 50th West  
City: Quartz Hill  
State: CA  
Zip Code: 93536  
Topic: Air Quality, Other/General Comment  
Comments: We have an air pollution problem here in California, no one can deny that. We also have an energy shortage. So, how do we solve these problems? With natural gas. It's clean burning and won't contribute to more poor air-quality. It's able to produce large amounts of energy and would help our state meet its current energy goals as well as its future goals. Cabrillo Port is a good idea. Not only for these reasons, but for so many more; mostly it has minimal impacts to the environment and creates domestic jobs. I encourage whoever is reviewing this project to support it. It's what our state needs.

G284-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.



Origin: E&E Website  
Date: 12/19/2004  
First Name: Arlene  
Last Name: Ferguson  
Address: 1016 Warmlanda Ave.  
City: Vista  
State: CA  
Zip Code: 92084  
Topic: Cumulative Impacts Analysis

Comments: We have to make certain that we will continue to have cheap energy costs in CA. We need supply to keep demand and costs down. We rely heavily on natural gas in our state, therefore we must produce more. Cabrillo Port will allow for more production of natural gas, and is almost completely unobtrusive to the our lives and the environment. What a bonus.

G201-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Origin: E&E Website  
Date: 12/19/2004  
First Name: Frank  
Last Name: Ferguson  
Address: 1016 Warmlanda Ave.  
City: Vista  
State: CA  
Zip Code: 92084  
Topic: Marine Traffic  
Comments: Project planners of Cabrillo Port have done an excellent job of minimizing impacts on marine traffic. There are going to have to be measures to restrict marine traffic, however the best planning was done early. By choosing a location far enough away from shipping channels, the project should have very small impact on this issue.

G198-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

308481

Kusano, Ken LT

USCG-2004-16877-620

**From:** Bob [bobf@earthling.net]  
**Sent:** Friday, November 05, 2004 2:47 PM  
**To:** Kusano, Ken LT  
**Subject:** LNG line into Oxnard

Lt. Ken Kusano,

I'm a resident in Oxnard and am not trying to halt our progress into the future, but I have only one question.

Why is it so important to bring the pipeline into Oxnard instead of piping it onto the coast south of Oxnard, say below Pt. Mugu, in that region? There's a zone in that area where the population density is low, and since the LNG is going into LA anyway it would lessen the traffic on already congested roadways in our area. G494-1

I'm just having a hard time understanding why Oxnard has to be the point of entry? Why here? Why not further south? California would still benefit from the LNG in just the same way as it would if it comes into Oxnard, but it would impact everyone in a more favorable way. G494-2

Please pass this letter along to all those that will be making the final decisions. I would attend the meetings coming up in our area, but will be out of the country during that time frame, sorry. G494-3

If there are any questions or comments that I can address, please forward them to my e mail address which I will be able to monitor during my absents.

Good luck,

Robert Fetter

G494-1

Section 3.3.7 contains information on the specific California locations considered in the alternatives analysis. The deepwater port would be 12.01 nautical miles (13.83 miles) offshore, as shown on Figure ES-1.

G494-2

The USCG, MARAD, and the CLSC received an application for a deepwater port off the shore of Ventura County. The USCG and MARAD are therefore required under NEPA to evaluate this alternative as the Applicant's preferred alternative. The agencies have evaluated this alternative in comparison with the other reasonable alternatives in compliance with NEPA and the CEQA.

The EIS/EIR initially evaluated 18 locations for the FSRU as potential locations for the deepwater port. It built on previous California Coastal Commission studies that evaluated nearly 100 locations. Section 3.3.7 contains information on other locations that were considered.

G494-3

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

308476  
Kusano, Ken LT

USCG-2004-16877-616

From: Diana Field [fieldd@oxnardsd.org]  
Sent: Friday, December 03, 2004 2:21 PM  
To: Kusano, Ken LT  
Subject: Comment Against LNG Facilities

<!-- /\* Style Definitions \*/ p.MsoNormal, li.MsoNormal, div.MsoNormal {margin:0in; margin-bottom:.0001pt; font-size:12.0pt; font-family:"Times New Roman";} a:link, span.MsoHyperlink {color:blue; text-decoration:underline;} a:visited, span.MsoHyperlinkFollowed {color:purple; text-decoration:underline;} span.EmailStyle17 {mso-style-type:personal-compose; font-family:Arial; color:windowtext;} @page Section1 {size:8.5in 11.0in; margin:1.0in 1.25in 1.0in 1.25in;} div.Section1 {page:Section1;} --> As a resident of Oxnard Shores, I am against location of any of the two proposed sites off the Oxnard Coast.

I feel not enough research has been completed regarding the safety of the LNG operations. G495-1  
I am concerned putting this sort of operations so close to a highly populated area. G495-2  
I am concerned to whether we do have a natural gas shortage, has enough research been done to support this? G495-3  
I am concerned has enough research been completed to looking for alternate sites away from heavy populated areas? G495-4  
I am concerned about the safety of having huge natural gas pipes in the location of schools, park, and residence areas! G495-5

Please do not be fall to the pressure of big business and allow the residents to decide if they want to take the risk of having LNG operations so close to home.

I am against it.

G495-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Section 4.2 and Appendix C contain information on public safety.

Sections 2.1 and 4.2.7.3 contain information on design criteria and specifications, final design requirements, and regulations governing the construction of the FSRU and LNG carriers.

G495-2

Section 1.2.3 contains updated information on natural gas needs in California. Forecast information has been obtained from the California Energy Commission.

G495-3

Section 4.2 and Appendix C contain information on public safety.

Sections 2.1 and 4.2.7.3 contain information on design criteria and specifications, final design requirements, and regulations governing the construction of the FSRU and LNG carriers.

G495-4

Section 3.3.7 contains information on the specific California locations considered in the alternatives analysis. The deepwater port would be 12.01 nautical miles (13.83 miles) offshore, as shown on Figure ES-1.

G495-5

Section 4.2.8 contains information on safety requirements for pipelines. Section 4.13.1 discusses the proximity of the proposed pipeline routes to residences and schools.

## Comment Form—Cabrillo Port LNG Deepwater Port draft EIS/EIR

Name (Please Print): Andy Fran Source: Public Meeting - Malibu  
 Organization/Agency: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: 12/1/2004  
 Street Address: 1008 Ocean Dr  
 City: Quesal State: CA Zip Code: 93085  
 Email address: \_\_\_\_\_

Please provide written comments in the space below and drop this form into the comment box.

### You may also submit comments

- Electronically through the Project Web site at <http://www.cabrilloport.ene.com>
- Electronically through the Docket Management System Web site (docket number 16877) at <http://dms.dot.gov>.
- Or by mail or email to following addresses:

Docket Management Facility  
 Room PL-401  
 400 Seventh Street SW  
 Washington, DC 20590-0001

California State Lands Commission  
 100 Howe Avenue, Suite 100-South  
 Sacramento, CA 95825  
 ogginsc@slc.ca.gov  
 Attention: Cy Oggins

All comments must be received by 2 p.m. PST, December 20, 2004

Comments (Use other side or attach additional sheets if necessary): I oppose this  
project? It is unproven technology. G390-1  
It is in a pristine part of  
our coast and I oppose  
any industrialization of our coast G390-2  
line in this channel Islands.  
This is an unsafe G390-3  
project for the  
the people next to the pipe line in  
the streets. Please extend the comment G390-4  
period

No action will be taken until the environmental review process is completed.

### G390-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Sections 2.1 and 4.2.7.3 contain information on design criteria and specifications, final design requirements, and regulations governing the construction of the FSRU and LNG carriers.

### G390-2

The FSRU would be located outside of the current boundary of the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary (CINMS) and vessels associated with Cabrillo Port operations would not be expected to enter the CINMS. Sections 4.7.1.4, 4.13.2.2, and 4.20.1.5 discuss the potential expansion of the CINMS boundary, which is not proposed at this time. Sections 4.7.4, 4.15.4, 4.16.4, and 4.18.4 describe potential impacts on the marine environment and proposed mitigation measures to reduce those potential impacts.

### G390-3

Section 4.2.8 contains information on safety requirements for pipelines. Section 4.13.1 discusses the proximity of the proposed pipeline routes to residences and schools.

### G390-4

All deepwater port applications fall under the authority of the Deepwater Port Act, which requires that a decision on the application be made within 330 days of the publication of the Notice of Application in the Federal Register. The Notice of Application for the Cabrillo Port Project was published in the Federal Register on January 27, 2004. Although the comment period (53 days) could not be extended at that time, a March 2006 Revised Draft EIR was recirculated under the CEQA for an additional public review period of 60 days. Section 1.4.1 contains additional information on this topic.

Section 1.5 contains information on opportunities for public comment. After the MARAD final license hearing, the public will have 45 days to comment on the Final EIS/EIR and the license application. The Federal and State agencies will have an additional 45 days to provide comments to the MARAD Administrator. The Administrator must issue the Record of Decision within 90 days after the final license hearing. The CSLC will hold a hearing to certify the EIR and make the decision whether to grant a lease. The California Coastal Commission will also hold a hearing. Comments received will be evaluated before any final decision is made regarding the proposed Project.



## Comment Form—Cabrillo Port LNG Deepwater Port draft EIS/EIR

Name (Please Print): Vicki Finan Source: Public Meeting - Malibu  
 Organization/Agency: Beacon Foundation Date: 12/1/2004  
 Street Address: Pm B 352 3844 Channel Islands Blvd  
 City: Marine State: CA Zip Code: 93035  
 Email address: \_\_\_\_\_

Please provide written comments in the space below and drop this form into the comment box.

## You may also submit comments

- Electronically through the Project Web site at <http://www.cabrilloport.ene.com>
- Electronically through the Docket Management System Web site (docket number 16877) at <http://dms.dot.gov>.
- Or by mail or email to following addresses:

Docket Management Facility  
 Room PL-401  
 400 Seventh Street SW  
 Washington, DC 20590-0001

California State Lands Commission  
 100 Howe Avenue, Suite 100-South  
 Sacramento, CA 95825  
[ogginsc@slc.ca.gov](mailto:ogginsc@slc.ca.gov)  
 Attention: Cy Oggins

All comments must be received by 2 p.m. PST, December 20, 2004

Comments (Use other side or attach additional sheets if necessary): \_\_\_\_\_ G100-1

I Believe that you should extend the comment period  
 for 60 days to allow <sup>for</sup> more ~~more~~ public input.  
 This Co. has spent way to much ~~and~~ and paid off to  
 many sp. interest groups.

G100-2

G100-3

This Project is ~~unsafe~~, and far to dangerous  
 to close to a very large population base. The high pressure  
~~gas~~ gas line is to close to 2 high schools! at least  
 1 elementary school. ~~A~~ group of affected persons that should  
 be consulted.

No action will be taken until the environmental review process is completed.

## G100-1

All deepwater port applications fall under the authority of the Deepwater Port Act, which requires that a decision on the application be made within 330 days of the publication of the Notice of Application in the Federal Register. The Notice of Application for the Cabrillo Port Project was published in the Federal Register on January 27, 2004. Although the comment period (53 days) could not be extended at that time, a March 2006 Revised Draft EIR was recirculated under the CEQA for an additional public review period of 60 days. Section 1.4.1 contains additional information on this topic.

Section 1.5 contains information on opportunities for public comment. After the MARAD final license hearing, the public will have 45 days to comment on the Final EIS/EIR and the license application. The Federal and State agencies will have an additional 45 days to provide comments to the MARAD Administrator. The Administrator must issue the Record of Decision within 90 days after the final license hearing. The CSLC will hold a hearing to certify the EIR and make the decision whether to grant a lease. The California Coastal Commission will also hold a hearing. Comments received will be evaluated before any final decision is made regarding the proposed Project.

## G100-2

Sections 2.1 and 4.2.7.3 contain information on design criteria and specifications, final design requirements, and regulations governing the construction of the FSRU and LNG carriers.

## G100-3

Section 4.2.8 contains information on safety requirements for pipelines. Section 4.13.1 discusses the proximity of the proposed pipeline routes to residences and schools.

Section 4.2.3, the Independent Risk Assessment (Appendix C1), and the Sandia Review of the Independent Risk Assessment (Appendix C2) contain additional information on public safety.

Origin: E&E Website  
 Date: 12/15/2004  
 First Name: Alyssa  
 Last Name: Firmin  
 Address: 1331 Ensenada Ave.  
 City: Santa Barbara  
 State: CA  
 Zip Code: 93103  
 Email: alyssafirmin@hotmail.com  
 Address:  
 Topic: Other/General Comment

**G042**

Comments: I am concerned that not enough time is being given to create the Environmental Impact Report. Also please make sure that the public comment period is extended.

**G042-1****G042-2****G042-1**

All deepwater port applications fall under the authority of the Deepwater Port Act, which requires that a decision on the application be made within 330 days of the publication of the Notice of Application in the Federal Register. The Notice of Application for the Cabrillo Port Project was published in the Federal Register on January 27, 2004. Although the comment period (53 days) could not be extended at that time, a March 2006 Revised Draft EIR was recirculated under the CEQA for an additional public review period of 60 days. Section 1.4.1 contains additional information on this topic.

Section 1.5 contains information on opportunities for public comment. After the MARAD final license hearing, the public will have 45 days to comment on the Final EIS/EIR and the license application. The Federal and State agencies will have an additional 45 days to provide comments to the MARAD Administrator. The Administrator must issue the Record of Decision within 90 days after the final license hearing. The CSLC will hold a hearing to certify the EIR and make the decision whether to grant a lease. The California Coastal Commission will also hold a hearing. Comments received will be evaluated before any final decision is made regarding the proposed Project.

**G042-2**

See the response to Comment G042-1.

Origin: E&E Website  
Date: 12/17/2004  
First Name: Wade  
Last Name: Fisher  
Address: 939 Coast Blvd #17b  
City: La Jolla  
State: CA  
Zip Code: 92037  
Topic: Energy and Minerals  
Comments: The Cabrillo Deepwater Port can supply California with 13% of its daily consumption of natural gas. That's a lot of gas! Anyone who has taken a basic economics course knows that an increase available supply will result in a decreased cost. I am looking forward to my utility bills going down because of the Cabrillo Deepwater Port.

G141-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.



Origin: E&E Website  
Date: 12/20/2004  
First Name: Andrew  
Last Name: Fitzgerald  
Address: 1062 Lafayette St.  
Unit F  
City: Denver  
State: CO  
Zip Code: 80218  
Topic: Alternatives

**G296**

Comments: Importing natural gas from Australia is an important step towards taking pressure off domestic drilling. There is a big strain on Colorado right now to provide California with the natural gas it needs. California needs to do its duty in exploring foreign gas alternatives in addition to its reliance on other states like Colorado. Cabrillo Port is an important step. Please support Cabrillo Port.

G296-1

G296-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Origin: E&E Website  
Date: 12/11/2004  
First Name: Galen  
Last Name: Fitzgerald  
Address: 1171 Fanshell Walk  
City: Oxnard  
State: CA  
Zip Code: 93035  
Phone No.: 805 985-5282  
Email Address: galenfitz@hotmail.com

Topic: Public Safety: Hazards and Risk Analysis, Other/General Comment

Comments: My name is Galen Fitzgerald. My wife Joyce and myself have lived in Oxnard, CA for over 30 years. The last nine years we worked prior to retirement, we operated a software related business in Oxnard.

We attended the open house and public meeting session in Oxnard on Nov. 30, 2004. We talked to people from the California State Lands Commission, Maritime Administration, U.S. Coast Guard and the local gas company. They answered all our questions and we now feel Cabrillo Port is a win-win situation for Oxnard and California.

California imports over 85% of its natural gas and Southern California is at the end of the supply line. With dwindling supplies and increased demand, we need additional supplies.

Cabrillo Port would be a huge boost to the local economy both during the construction phase and the operating phase. This is especially true since BHP Billiton tries to use local labor and materials. BHP Billiton also commits 1% of gross income from the project to the local area.

Some people are against the project due to risks involved. We feel the risk is very low and well worth taking to get the added supply of natural gas to keep our economy growing.

We hope common sense will prevail and this project will be approved as soon as possible.

G018-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Origin: E&E Website  
Date: 12/15/2004  
First Name: Sean  
Last Name: Fitzgerald  
Address: 2324 Fillmore St.  
City: San Francisco  
State: CA  
Zip Code: 94115  
Topic: Alternatives  
Comments: Renewable energy is not a realistic alternative to fossil fuels at this point. Until it is, we need to find ways to provide cost effective energy to warm our homes and power our economy. The Cabrillo Port project will provide cleaner burning natural gas that can generate this energy and replace some of our dependence on coal burning power plants, which pollute our beautiful state! That is why we need the Cabrillo Port project.

G034-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Origin: E&E Website  
Date: 12/20/2004  
First Name: Heidi  
Last Name: Flydal  
Address: 11673-2 Compass Point Drive North  
City: San Diego  
State: CA  
Zip Code: 92126  
Phone No.: 858-271-4280

Topic: Energy and Minerals

Comments: With today's rising fuel costs, Californians need to look at alternative sources of energy, whether it be safe, env. friendly off-shore drilling or other safe, env. friendly energy resources.

G264-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Origin: E&E Website  
Date: 12/20/2004  
First Name: Rich  
Last Name: Ford  
Address: 1833 Drew Ct.  
City: Carmichael  
State: CA  
Zip Code: 95608  
Topic: Biological Resources - Marine, Biological Resources - Terrestrial  
Comments: My main concern about this project was the potential damage to marine life the water quality. After reviewing the EIS I can see that the agencies that prepared the document made sure that these things would be protected. Midigation measures will further insure that any damage done is being counteracted. Truly I'm impressed with the Coast Guard for going the extra mile to hold companies accountable for the damage to the environment their money making endervours may cause. As well, I'm impressed with BHP's willingness to restructure their project based on the comments received.

G245-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Origin: E&E Website  
Date: 12/15/2004  
First Name: Mark  
Last Name: Foreman  
Address: 731 Skylark Dr.  
City: Chico  
State: CA  
Zip Code: 95926  
Topic: Air Quality  
Comments: Having a LNG port facility off the coast of California makes sense in order to help us transition to cleaner fuel sources. It follows that the boats used by a LNG facility should also use cleaner burning fuels. IT is nice to see the BHP facility has taken this common sense step to help improve our environment.

G030-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Origin: E&E Website  
Date: 12/20/2004  
First Name: Mark  
Last Name: Foreman  
Address: 731 Skylark Dr.  
City: Chico  
State: CA  
Topic: Other/General Comment

Comments: It seems lawmakers in this state have long forgotten the first lesson in economics; supply and demand. In the name of many unrealistic arguments we have passed on sensible energy solutions like Cabrillo Port. Please do your duty for our state and support this project. More energy solutions (supply) lead to cheaper prices and no energy crisis's (demand). There are few arguments that hold up against a logical project like Cabrillo Port.

G302-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Origin: E&E Website  
Date: 12/15/2004  
First Name: Carrie  
Last Name: Forrest  
Address: 3308 Ocean Drive  
City: Oxnard  
State: CA  
Zip Code: 93035  
Topic: Other/General Comment

**G029**

Comments: I am deeply opposed to having this port off our coast. There are too many potential hazards to our safety and no benefits to the residents! Take it somewhere else!

**G029-1****G029-1**

Section 3.3.7 contains information on the specific California locations considered in the alternatives analysis. The deepwater port would be 12.01 nautical miles (13.83 miles) offshore, as shown on Figure ES-1.



Do not allow the Deepwater Port to be installed off our coastline. There are too many unknown hazards with no benefits to the residents. Put it somewhere else less populated! Would you want it just a few miles from where you live? I don't think so.

G107-1

G107-1

Section 3.3.7 contains information on the specific California locations considered in the alternatives analysis. Section 4.2.7.6 and the Independent Risk Assessment (Appendix C1) contain information on public safety impacts from various incidents at the FSRU. The analysis indicates that the maximum impact distance of an accident would involve a vapor cloud dispersion extending 6.3 nautical miles (7.3 miles) from the FSRU. The FSRU would be located approximately 12.01 nautical miles (13.83 miles) offshore; therefore, consequences of an accident involving LNG transport by carrier and storage on the FSRU would extend no closer than 5.7 nautical miles (6.5 miles) from the shoreline. Figure ES-1 depicts the consequence distances surrounding the FSRU location for worst credible events.

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Came Forrest

Origin: E&E Website  
Date: 12/19/2004  
First Name: Brandy  
Last Name: Fort  
Address: 905 Jurymast Dr.  
City: Oxnard  
State: CA  
Zip Code: 93030  
Topic: Other/General Comment

Comments: I think what is being proposed here is a good thing. Natural gas is harder to find nowadays. If we deny every application for a foreign company to do business off our coast in the future when we have no other choice than to get natural gas from another country they will just say that's too bad and that we had our chance and we won't have any other companies interested in doing business here. Then what will we do.

G239-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Origin: E&E Website  
Date: 12/19/2004  
First Name: Michael  
Last Name: Fort  
Address: 905 Jurymast Dr.  
City: Oxnard  
State: CA  
Zip Code: 93030  
Topic: Noise  
Comments: I just wanted to say that I am for this project. I feel that there are so many benefits from having a port like this in our state. Lower prices, and cleaner air just to name a few. There is no concern with the safety issue because the port is located so far off the coast. Also because it is so far away we won't even know its there. We won't be able to see it and we won't be able to hear it. Thank you for reading my comment.

G315-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Origin: E&E Website  
Date: 12/13/2004  
First Name: Bill  
Last Name: Fox  
Title: Mr.  
Address: 27155 Clifton Ave  
City: Highland  
State: CA  
Zip Code: 92346  
Topic: Public Safety: Hazards and Risk Analysis  
Comments: Dear Collaborating Agencies:

It's encouraging to see an actual study of the risks of LNG in this study. There has been a lot of hysteria out here about a 30-mile ball of fire, which belongs in a Hollywood movie, not in a federal document. The analysis which says that the risks of a worst-case scenario would be limited to a 1.6-mile area makes me feel even better knowing that the facility is located almost ten times as far off-shore.

Thanks for registering my support for this project,

Bill Fox

G021-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Origin: E&E Website  
Date: 12/13/2004  
First Name: Derek  
Last Name: Fox  
Title: Mr  
Address: 835 Katella Street  
City: Laguna Beach  
State: CA  
Topic: Agriculture and Soils  
Comments: To Whom it may concern,

G019-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Because of its location fourteen miles off-shore there are little or no negative impacts of an LNG facility like the Cabrillo Port on the agricultural business. However, by restraining increases in the cost of Natural Gas—a key component of several parts of agricultural production—building the project can only benefit Ventura County's agricultural communities."

We all use natural gas. Governor Schwarzenegger has converted his Hummer to natural gas to reduce pollution and if we can all increase availability, I can see a day when we use a combination of wind, solar, and natural gas for the future.

Thanks,

Mr Derek Fox

Origin: E&E Website  
Date: 12/16/2004  
First Name: Kevin  
Last Name: Fox  
Address: 12697 Magnolia  
City: Riverside  
State: CA  
Zip Code: 92503  
Topic: Environmental Justice  
Comments: Part of the reason California needs more natural gas is because it is a clean-burning source of power. It only makes sense, then, that a Natural Gas importation facility like Cabrillo Port use natural gas, instead of diesel, to power its boats. I'm glad to see BHP is taking this simple, logical measure to protect our environment.

Right now many tankers and tug boats use dirty diesel fuel. This project would use only natural gas to power its tankers and tug boats. For the sake of our environment, please approve this project.

G304-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Origin: E&E Website

Date: 12/19/2004

First Name: Lena

Last Name: Fradella

City: Temple City

State: CA

Zip Code: 91780

Topic: Biological Resources - Terrestrial

Comments: I am impressed that state regulators are requiring BHPB to be proactive about their impacts on endangered species in reagards to the Cabrillo Port Project. Too often it's an after thought and marine life goes unprotected. It's good to see a state agency doing its job so effectively. As well, I've heard some fishermen might be upset that fishing will be restricted around the port. While I'm a recreationalist myself, I see this restriction as a plus. It will create its own marine sanctuary which will benefit the biodiversity of the region.

G203-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Origin: E&E Website  
Date: 12/19/2004  
First Name: Tony  
Last Name: Fradella  
Address: 4824 Heleo St.  
City: Temple City  
State: CA  
Zip Code: 91780  
Topic: Cumulative Impacts Analysis

Comments: There are no more places left to drill for natural gas in California. I was horrified earlier this year when I opened my utilities bill. I could barely afford what I was paying to begin with. We have to find a way to produce more natural gas for our state. We must support companies like BHPB to create alternatives to drilling inland and bring jobs to our communities. Not only do the jobs stimulate our communities, so does cheaper energy costs.

G263-

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.



Name (Please Print): Deirdre Frank Source: Public Meeting - Oxnard PM  
 Organization/Agency: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: 11/30/2004  
 Street Address: 5244 Seabreeze way  
 City: Oxnard State: CA Zip Code: 93035  
 Email address: \_\_\_\_\_

Please provide written comments in the space below and drop this form into the comment box.

**You may also submit comments**

- Electronically through the Project Web site at <http://www.cabrilloport.ene.com>
- Electronically through the Docket Management System Web site (docket number 16877) at <http://dms.dot.gov>
- Or by mail or email to following addresses:

Docket Management Facility  
 Room PL-401  
 400 Seventh Street SW  
 Washington, DC 20590-0001

California State Lands Commission  
 100 Howe Avenue, Suite 100-South  
 Sacramento, CA 95825  
 ogginsc@slc.ca.gov  
 Attention: Cy Oggins

**All comments must be received by 2 p.m. PST, December 20, 2004**

Comments (Use other side or attach additional sheets if necessary): Opposed to  
this project. Oxnard should not be  
an experiment for untried offshore G076-1  
facility w/undesigned platform in  
seismic area. Compromising value G076-2  
of land w/ undergrounding of pipes is  
bad. Do not believe any energy "crisis"  
warrants this intrusion into our G076-3  
ocean.

No action will be taken until the environmental review process is completed.

G076-1

Sections 2.1 and 4.2.7.3 contain information on design criteria and specifications, final design requirements, and regulations governing the construction of the FSRU and LNG carriers.

G076-2

Section 4.16.1.2 contains updated information on property values.

G076-3

Section 1.2.3 contains updated information on natural gas needs in California. Forecast information has been obtained from the California Energy Commission.

Origin: E&E Website  
Date: 12/20/2004  
First Name: Ann  
Last Name: Fuelling  
Address: 4729 Hayford Way #1  
City: Sacramento  
State: CA  
Zip Code: 95842  
Topic: Other/General Comment

Comments: Terrorists, exploding gas lines, earthquakes, ships straying in the fog.....the things people create in their minds. It makes me think Michael Moore is right, we are living in fear. We'll be living in fear if we have another energy crisis that crushed our economy. Who will be complaining then? Look, I understand concerns, but we've got to support projects that are solid, good for the environment and good for the economy. Cabrillo Port is it.

G383-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Origin: E&E Website  
Date: 12/20/2004  
First Name: Don  
Last Name: Fuelling  
Address: 6970 Pampas Way  
City: Fair Oaks  
State: CA  
Zip Code: 95628  
Topic: Other/General Comment

Comments: I would merely like to say that I support this project's development. I believe that the agencies who compiled the EIS/EIR did a thorough job, and BHPB complied in a more than a company is expected. As with any energy production project, there is always going to be someone who has something to complain about. It is the job of our federal agencies to decipher that information and make a decision based upon facts - good or weighing the bad. I have faith that will happen in this situation and that Cabrillo Port will be built. I appreciate you allowing me to comment.

G279-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Origin: E&E Website  
Date: 12/20/2004  
First Name: Lillian  
Last Name: Fuelling  
Address: 5148 Chicago Ave.  
City: Fair Oaks  
State: CA  
Zip Code: 95628  
Topic: Air Quality  
Comments: California needs clean air energy sources. Natural gas provides just that. I'm in support of this project to many reasons, but clean air is a big one. I don't want to see our country turning to coal anymore. I don't want to hear about the rising cases of asthma among children. I don't want to feel like I have to stay in my house all day because of poor air quality. Natural gas can be used in so many ways. Please allow for natural gas to be more readily used by approving the building of Cabrillo Port.

G337-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Name (Please Print): MICHAEL FULLILOVE

Organization/Agency: BRUSCO TUG-E-BARGE INC.

Street Address: 417 E. PORT HUENEME RD # 337

City: PORT HUENEME State: CA Zip Code: 93041

Email address: BRUSCO TUGZ @ AOL.COM

Source:  
Public Meeting - Oxnard PM

Date: 11/30/2004

Please provide written comments in the space below and drop this form into the comment box.

**You may also submit comments**

- Electronically through the Project Web site at <http://www.cabrilloport.ene.com>
- Electronically through the Docket Management System Web site (docket number 16877) at <http://dms.dot.gov>.
- Or by mail or email to following addresses:

Docket Management Facility  
Room PL-401  
400 Seventh Street SW  
Washington, DC 20590-0001

California State Lands Commission  
100 Howe Avenue, Suite 100-South  
Sacramento, CA 95825  
ogginsc@slc.ca.gov  
Attention: Cy Oggins

**All comments must be received by 2 p.m. PST, December 20, 2004**

Comments (Use other side or attach additional sheets if necessary): I RECOGNIZE THE NEED  
FOR A STABLE, RELIABLE, ENERGY SOURCE TO HELP STABILIZE PRICES AND  
TO REDUCE THE RISK OF PRICE SPIKES FROM HARMING OUR ECONOMY.  
WE NEED MORE IMPORTED NATURAL GAS TO SUPPORT OUR POPULATION  
GROWTH + MAINTAIN OUR STANDARD OF LIVING.

CABRILLO PORT WILL SAFELY SUPPLY 15 TO 18% OF THE NEEDED  
NATURAL GAS IMPORTS WITH MINIMAL IMPACT ON THE COASTLINE,  
SEA, AND AIR. AT THE SAME TIME CABRILLO PORT WILL PROVIDE  
MILLIONS OF DOLLARS TO THE LOCAL AREA ECONOMY.

No action will be taken until the environmental review process is completed.

G092-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

From a maritime view, The projects planners have put maritime Trade And Safety first by locating Carrillo Port well outside The Shipping Lanes.

The Support Vessel will be of sufficient size + horsepower To deal with Any Emergency pertaining To The LNG Terminal And To merchant Traffic leaving out of The Shipping Lanes. In Addition The LNG Terminal will create Another Source of vessel Traffic management by using manned Radar Stations And constant Radio communication with passing Vessels. All vessels will be Inspected Regularly And will be using Local Licensed Pilots with years of experience in This Area. All vessels will be escorted To + From The LNG Terminal And Support Vessels will be standing by at All Times.

With The excellent Safety Record of handling LNG in The maritime Industry, I strongly support The Carrillo Port Project To meet our rising Energy Needs.

December 2, 2004

California State Lands Commission  
100 Howe Avenue, Suite 100-South  
Sacramento, CA 95825

Att: Cy Oggins

USCG-2004-16877-640

Re: Cabrillo Port Liquefied Natural Gas Deepwater Port Project

Last night I attended a public meeting on the draft EIS/EIR for the above project.

Not only does the project pose a threat to the marine life in the area, but the conflicting reports on possible danger to the public submitted at the meeting I attended last night pose a threat to the 14 million visitors to the area each year.

G496-1

G496-2

Sincerely,

*Mrs. Marsha Fullmer*

Mrs. Marsha Fullmer  
28935 Selfridge Drive  
Malibu, CA 90265

G496-1

Section 4.7.4 discusses this topic.

G496-2

Section 4.2 and Appendix C contain additional and revised information on public safety.

307959

2004/G544

DEPT OF TRANSPORTATION  
DOCKETS

December 2, 2004

2004 DEC 13 A 10:12

USCG-2004-16877-604

Docket Management Facility  
Room PL-401  
400 Seventh Street  
Washington, DC 20590-0001

Re: Cabrillo Port Liquefied Natural Gas Deepwater Port Project

Last night I attended a public meeting on the draft EIS/EIR for the above project.

Not only does the project pose a threat to the marine life in the area, but the conflicting reports on possible danger to the public submitted at the meeting I attended last night pose a threat to the 14 million visitors to the area each year.

G511-1  
G511-2

Sincerely,

*Mrs. Marsha Fullmer*

Mrs. Marsha Fullmer  
28935 Selfridge Drive  
Malibu, CA 90265



Origin: E&E Website  
Date: 12/20/2004  
First Name: Cassandra  
Last Name: Fuote  
Topic: Other/General Comment  
Comments: I'm tired of rising natural gas bills and support the construction of new facilities to increase the supply and reduce the price! The plan to have Cabrillo Port far from shore seems to simultaneously address issues of safety, aesthetics as well as energy supply. Those who whine about it are missing a critical fact: It has to go SOMEwhere, right?

G283-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.